

F_2 STRUCTURE FUNCTION AND HIGHER-TWIST CONTRIBUTIONS (NONSINGLET CASE)

A. V. KOTIKOV, V. G. KRIVOKHIMINE

Particle Physics Laboratory, JINR

Dubna, 141980 Russia

E-mail: kotikov@sunse.jinr.ru, kvg@sunse2.jinr.ru

We performed the combine fits of SLAC, BCDMS and NMC data at NLO level. The data are fitted very well with different parametrizations of higher twist contributions. The theory-based parametrizations lead to the low values of QCD parameter $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{f=4} \sim 140 \pm 21 \text{ MeV}$ (or $\alpha_s(M_Z^2) \sim 0.103 \pm 0.002$).

The accuracy of the present data for deep inelastic (DIS) structure functions (SF) reached the level at which the Q^2 -dependence of logarithmic QCD-motivated and power-like ones may be studied separately (see, for example, the recent reviews¹ and references therein). In the present letter we analyse at NLO order of perturbative QCD the most known DIS SF $F_2(x, Q^2)$ taking into account SLAC, BCDMS and NMC² experimental data. We stress the power-like effects, so-called twist-4 (i.e. $\sim 1/Q^2$) and twist-6 (i.e. $\sim 1/Q^4$) contributions. To our purposes we represent the SF $F_2(x, Q^2)$ as the contribution of the part $F_2^{pQCD}(x, Q^2)$ (including target mass corrections (TMC)) described by perturbative QCD and the nonperturbative part:

$$F_2(x, Q^2) = F_2^{pQCD}(x, Q^2) + \frac{h_4(x)}{Q^2} + \frac{h_6(x)}{Q^4} \quad (1)$$

Contrary to standard fits (see, for example,³) when the direct numerical calculations based on DGLAP equation are used to evaluate of SF, we use the exact solution of DGLAP equation for the Mellin moments of $F_2^{pQCD}(x, Q^2)$ and the subsequent reproduction of $F_2(x, Q^2)$ at some Q^2 -value with help of the Jacobi Polynomial expansion method^{4,5,6}

$$F_2^{N_{max}}(x, Q^2) = x^\alpha (1-x)^\beta \sum_{n=0}^{N_{max}} \Theta_n^{\alpha, \beta}(x) \sum_{j=0}^n c_j^{(n)}(\alpha, \beta) M_{j+2}(Q^2), \quad (2)$$

where $\Theta_n^{\alpha, \beta}$ are the Jacobi polynomials and α, β are their parameters, fixed by the condition of the requirement of the minimization of the error of the reconstruction of the structure functions.

For n -space eq.(1) transforms to

$$M_n(Q^2) = M_n^{pQCD}(Q^2) + \left[\frac{C_4(n)}{Q^2} + \frac{C_6(n)}{Q^4} \right] \cdot M_n^{NS}(Q^2), \quad (3)$$

where (hereafter ($a = 4, 6$)) $C_a(n) = \int_0^1 x^{n-2} h_a(x) dx / M_n^{NS}(Q^2)$. The Q^2 -evolution of the moments $M_n^{NS}(Q^2)$ is given by the well known perturbation QCD formulae (see⁷). The moments $M_n^{pQCD}(Q^2)$ are distinct from $M_n^{NS}(Q^2)$ by including TMC. The moment $M_n^{NS}(Q_0^2)$ is theoretical input of our analysis and its parameters should be found together with $h_4(x)$, $h_6(x)$ and QCD parameter Λ by the fits of experimental data.

The shapes $h_a(x)$ of the higher twist (HT) corrections are of primary consideration in our analysis. They are choosen in the several different forms.

- The twist-4 and twist-6 terms are fixed in agreement with the infrared renormalon model (see⁸ and references therein). The values of HT coefficient functions $C_4(n)$ and $C_6(n)$ are given (see⁸) in the form $C_a^{ren}(n) = B_a(n) \cdot A_a^{ren}$, where $B_a(n)$ are known n -dependent functions and A_a^{ren} are some coefficients. The values of A_a^{ren} have been estimated (in⁸) as $A_4^{ren} = 0.2 \text{ GeV}^2$ and $A_6^{ren} = (A_4^{ren})^2 = 0.04 \text{ GeV}^4$. We use them here as free parameters.
- The twist-4 term in the form $h_4(x) \sim \frac{d}{dx} \ln F_2^{NS}(x, Q^2) \sim 1/(1-x)$. This behaviour matches the fact that higher twist effects are usually important only at higher x . The twist-4 coefficient function has the form $C_4^{der}(n) = (n-1)A_4^{der}$.
- HT terms are considered as free parameters at each x_i bin. They have the form $h_a^{free}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^I h_a(x_i)$, where I is the number of bins. The constants $h_a(x_i)$ (one per x -bin) parametrize x -dependence of $h_a^{free}(x)$.

To clear up the importance of HT terms we fit SLAC, BCDMS and NMC (H_2 and D_2) data² (including the systematical errors), keeping identical form of perturbative part at NLO approximation. We choose hereafter $Q_0^2 = 10 \text{ GeV}^2$, $N_{max} = 6$, $0.3 \leq x \leq 0.9$ and $I = 6$. Basic characteristics of the quality of the fits are χ^2/DOF for SF F_2 and for its slope $d \ln F_2 / d \ln Q^2$, which has very sensitive perturbative properties (see⁷). We use MINUIT program for minimization of two χ^2 values:

$$\chi^2(F_2) = \left| \frac{F_2^{exp} - F_2^{teor}}{\Delta F_2^{exp}} \right|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \chi^2(\text{slope}) = \left| \frac{b^{exp} - b^{teor}}{\Delta b^{exp}} \right|^2, \quad \left(b = \frac{d \ln F_2}{d \ln Q^2} \right)$$

We obtain the following results:

- Only perturbative QCD part is included (i.e. $C_a = 0$, $M_{nuc}^2 = 0$):
 $\chi^2/DOF(F_2) = \frac{3258}{567}$, $\chi^2/DOF(\text{slope}) = \frac{1977}{7}$, $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{f=4} = 300 \pm 5 \text{ MeV}$
- Only TMC are included (i.e. $C_a = 0$):
 $\chi^2/DOF(F_2) = \frac{1145}{567}$, $\chi^2/DOF(\text{slope}) = \frac{464}{7}$, $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{f=4} = 257 \pm 5 \text{ MeV}$
- TMC and h_4^{free} (see Table) are included:
 $\chi^2/DOF(F_2) = \frac{369}{560}$, $\chi^2/DOF(\text{slope}) = \frac{15}{7}$, $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{f=4} = 287 \pm 28 \text{ MeV}$
- TMC, C_4^{der} and h_6^{free} (see Table) are included:
 $\chi^2/DOF(F_2) = \frac{462}{559}$, $\chi^2/DOF(\text{slope}) = \frac{70}{7}$, $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{f=4} = 154 \pm 22 \text{ MeV}$
 $A^{der}(H_2) = 0.244 \pm 0.041 \text{ GeV}^2$, $A^{der}(D_2) = 0.162 \pm 0.037 \text{ GeV}^2$
- TMC, C_4^{ren} and C_6^{ren} are included:
 $\chi^2/DOF(F_2) = \frac{560}{567}$, $\chi^2/DOF(\text{slope}) = \frac{15}{7}$, $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{f=4} = 125 \pm 17 \text{ MeV}$
 $A_4^{ren}(H_2) = 0.485 \pm 0.035 \text{ GeV}^2$, $A_4^{ren}(D_2) = 0.457 \pm 0.032 \text{ GeV}^2$
 $A_6^{ren}(H_2) = 0.0070 \pm 0.0005 \text{ GeV}^4$, $A_6^{ren}(D_2) = 0.0024 \pm 0.0006 \text{ GeV}^4$

Let us now present the main results.

- The different parametrizations of HT terms lead to very good fits of SLAC, BCDMS and NMC data ². Including twist-4 term correction as free parameters at each x_i bin leads to $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{f=4} \sim 286 \pm 28 \text{ MeV}$ (or $\alpha_s(M_Z^2) \sim 0.114 \pm 0.002$). However, the HT terms, which are obtained in the framework of infrared renormalon model and also in the form of the derivative $\frac{d}{dx} \ln F_2^{NS}(x, Q^2)$, lead to the lower values of QCD parameter $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{f=4} \sim 140 \pm 21 \text{ MeV}$ (or $\alpha_s(M_Z^2) \sim 0.103 \pm 0.002$). It is in perfect agreement with the recent results ⁹ of DELPHI Collaboration, where the strong reduction of the $\alpha_s(M_Z^2)$ value was observed when renormalon-type power corrections have been included. The reduction in ⁹ is even stronger because the nonperturbative part for the cross sections of e^+e^- collisions starts ¹⁰ with the $1/\sqrt{Q^2}$ term. Moreover, similar effect of the reduction of the $\alpha_s(M_Z^2)$ value has been also observed earlier in the analyses of DIS data based on NNLO approximation ⁶ of perturbative part and also on scheme-invariant perturbation theory ⁵ resumming a part of higher order terms.

- Twist-4 terms are very similar to ones obtained in³, when we considered them as free parameters.
- Twist-6 terms are different for proton and deuteron SF that seems to indicate a nonzero nuclear correlations in deuteron.

Table. The values of the parameters for h_4^{free} (GeV^2) and h_6^{free} (GeV^4).

x_i	0.35	0.45	0.55	0.65	0.75	0.85
$h_4^{free}(H_2)$	-0.245 $\pm$ 0.025	-0.171 $\pm$ 0.045	-0.029 $\pm$ 0.076	0.336 $\pm$ 0.133	0.759 $\pm$ 0.239	1.41 $\pm$ 0.60
$h_4^{free}(D_2)$	-0.205 $\pm$ 0.030	-0.064 $\pm$ 0.048	0.106 $\pm$ 0.078	0.271 $\pm$ 0.128	0.426 $\pm$ 0.213	1.44 $\pm$ 0.55
$h_6^{free}(H_2)$	-0.266 $\pm$ 0.018	-0.425 $\pm$ 0.054	-0.618 $\pm$ 0.134	-0.448 $\pm$ 0.414	-1.61 $\pm$ 0.99	-9.52 $\pm$ 4.32
$h_6^{free}(D_2)$	-0.198 $\pm$ 0.020	-0.139 $\pm$ 0.057	0.003 $\pm$ 0.137	0.147 $\pm$ 0.398	-0.651 $\pm$ 0.821	3.72 $\pm$ 4.36

Acknowledgments

One of us (AVK) is gratefull very much to Organizing Committee of Workshop DIS98 for the financial support.

References

1. M. Maul *et al.*, hep-ph/9612300, hep-ph/9710392; V.M. Braun, hep-ph/9708386; B.R. Webber, hep-ph/9712236.
2. BCDMS Collab., A.C. Benevenuti *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **B223**, 485 (1989), **B237**, 592 (1990); SLAC Collab., L.W. Whitlow *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **B282**, 475 (1992), Ph.D. Thesis, Standford University, SLAC report 357 (1990); NMC Collab., M. Arneodo *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **B364**, 107 (1995), *Nucl. Phys.* **B483**, 3 (1997).
3. M. Virchaux and A. Milsztajn, *Phys. Lett.* **B274**, 221 (1992).
4. G. Parisi and N. Surlas, *Nucl. Phys.* **B151**, 421 (1979); V.G. Kriukhizhin *et al.*, *Z. Phys.* **C36**, 51 (1987), **C48**, 347 (1990).
5. A.V. Kotikov *et al.*, *Z. Phys.* **C58**, 465 (1993).
6. G. Parente *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **B333**, 190 (1994); A.L. Kataev *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **B388**, 179 (1996), **B417**, 374 (1998); A.V. Sidorov, *Phys. Lett.* **B389**, 379 (1996); A.V. Sidorov and M.V. Tokarev, *Phys. Lett.* **B358**, 353 (1996).
7. A. Buras, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **52**, 199 (1980).
8. M. Dasgupta and B.R. Webber, *Phys. Lett.* **B382**, 273 (1996).
9. DELPHI Collab., P. Abreu *et al.*, CERN-PPE/97-108.
10. Yu.L. Dokshitser and B.R. Webber, *Phys. Lett.* **B352**, 451 (1995); M. Dasgupta and B.R. Webber, *Nucl. Phys.* **B484**, 247 (1997).